DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 019 FL 022 876

AUTHOR Carstens, W. A. M.
TITLE The State of the Art: Text/Discourse Studies in South Africa--Organization or Disorganization?
PUB DATE Aug 94
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at a Conference on Organization in Discourse (Turku, Finland, August 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Afrikaans; *Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; *Language Research; *Linguistic Theory; *Research Needs; Trend Analysis; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *South Africa

ABSTRACT

The status of text/discourse research in South Africa is analyzed. The discussion begins with some background information on the nature of discourse research, and proceeds to an overview of the whole field of discourse research in that country and then a look at research on Afrikaans discourse. Both general trends and specific areas of research focus are examined. It is suggested that textual research has been somewhat hit-and-miss, but that a significant area of study has been of the "standards of textuality": i.e., cohesion, coherence, intentionality/acceptability of text, the way in which sentence elements are used to carry communicative values, contextual qualities, and relationships between texts. It is further noted that some of that available research has not been intended to focus on discourse, but has done so in the course of studying a specific text. It is concluded that while some Afrikaans discourse research has been undertaken, much more is needed. Contains 191 references. (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 381 019

*Copy of a paper read at the conference on "Organization in Discourse" in Turku, Finland - August 1994.*

# THE STATE OF THE ART: TEXT/DISCOURSE STUDIES IN SOUTH AFRICA - ORGANIZATION OR DISORGANIZATION?

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. A. M. Carstens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

*Prof. W.A.M. Carstens*
*Dept. of Afrikaans and Dutch*
*Potchefstroom University for CHE*
*POTCHEFSTROOM 2520*
*South Africa*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Up till now there has not been a serious effort to try and establish what the state of text/discourse research is in South Africa. One exception in this field is Botha (1986) who tried to give an overview of work done in relation to text interpretation from a theological perspective. In Carstens' manuscript on Afrikaans text linguistics a short reference was made to some sources which could be used when doing text linguistic research in SA. It became clear that a distinct pattern towards doing text/discourse research was lacking and that the field of research left a lot to be desired. Certain quite relevant questions can be asked as a result of this: what is happening in text/discourse research in South Africa? Or put in another way: what is the state of the art of text/discourse research in South Africa? In other words: What has been done already? Which gaps can be identified? Who are the people doing research towards text linguistics/discourse analysis in the country? Which theoretical model has been used as basis for the research? It is possible to argue that for example research done in English in other parts of the world also has relevance for South Africa. This may partly be true but the fact is that we have a different context in South Africa and if we want to be relevant in our research we also have to look at things from our point of view. Therefore international research will be useful - and certainly relevant - for local researchers but it is possible that the local researcher might look at the same sort of text in a different way. This to my mind makes it worthwhile to look at the local content of text/discourse research.

In the light of this background the purpose of this paper is twofold: to establish (a) the trends and (b) the particular focal areas of text/discourse research in South Africa. This will be done in two ways: first a cursory discussion of the

total field of text/discourse research in South Africa will be provided and it will be followed by an overview of specific research on this topic in Afrikaans. I do hope that the end result of this effort will shed more light on the organization/ disorganization of textual research in SA.

## 2. WHAT DOES A STUDY OF TEXT/DISCOURSE IMPLY?

The first important thing a researcher has to do when starting with text/discourse research is to get clarity about what his primary field of research is. It seems that we are confined with two related but also distinctive terms, namely **text** and **discourse**. It is not always so important to make a clear theoretical distinction between these two terms but from a practical point of view it will be useful to establish what is meant when a term is used.

**Discourse** is normally used in relation with 'discourse analysis' and **text** with regard to 'text linguistics'. A study of the relevant literature does not help to bring clarity about the exact differences between 'text linguistics' and 'discourse analysis'. Prince (1988: 164), for example, says that discourse analysis is "...without a doubt one of the most widely used and loosely defined terms in the entire field of linguistics" because it is so widely applicable. She adds: "'Discourse analysis' denotes many fields: the term has been and no doubt will continue to be used in different ways by sociolinguists, ethnomethodologists, ethnolinguists, psycholinguists, literary theorists, and computational linguists, among others, as long as they find the study of stretches of language relevant". These "stretches of language" are also important for a study of the 'text', because the text linguist wants to establish whether these "stretches" are coherent and why it is accepted as something that is understood as a coherent text by language users.

Quite a few references in the literature suggest that, because of this overlapping data basis (i.e. "stretches of language"), text linguistics and discourse analysis are complementary terms and that in fact we have to do with different 'academic labels' for the same research area. De Beaugrande (1985: 41) for example says in this regard: "Some sources...treat 'discourse analysis' as merely an English equivalent of the German term 'Textlinguistik'... At present, the two designations are chiefly academic labels for the same domain". Malmkjaer (ed.)(1991: 461) also makes reference to "...the overlap between text linguistics and discourse and conversation analysis"; Bell (1991: 162) adds that "'text' and 'discourse' are used interchangeably by some linguists" while Hoey (1991: 196-197) corroborates this as he indicates that these two terms are used interchangebly by some linguists and that on the other hand other linguists make a fine distinction between the terms: "...the way that they are distinguished not only differs from writer to writer, but even on occasion, within a writer's work from one year to the next".

Stubbs (1983: 1) gives another starting point when he says: "I will use (discourse analysis)...to refer mainly to the linguistic analysis of naturally occuring spoken or written discourse. Roughly speaking, it refers to attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts". Reddick's (1986: 32) viewpoint about text linguistics corresponds with this: "Text linguistics is the study of the linguistic structure of texts considered independently of individual language users. It aims to discover, enumerate, and explicate the general principles that govern the text as a linguistic object". It therefore seems we have to do with the same object of study: the linguistic structure of stretches of language. It seems further that the only difference suggested by these authors is that traditionally the same object was approached from two different angles: the American approach vs the European approach. It basically is the same object that is investigated: spoken or written language depending from which angle the researcher looks at it. To my mind it makes sense - and I might be terribly wrong on this point! - to rather use De Beaugrande's (1985: 48) general description of text linguistics, namely "...text linguistics is an overall designation for *any linguistic exploration* of the text", as a starting point for textual research and apply it to any piece of spoken or written language that I want to study. This gives me the opportunity to at least have a viable working definition of what I want to do, namely to research the nature and extent of textual study in South Africa and especially in Afrikaans.

## 3. THE NATURE OF TEXTUAL RESEARCH IN SOUTH AFRICA

Research in South Africa on textual aspects only really started to gain momentum towards the early 1980's. The total research output, i.e. for all the SA languages, is certainly not very impressive when compared with research in other countries. It consists of two books (both in Afrikaans and dated 1955 and 1988 - cf. Hellinga & Scholtz 1955, Wybenga 1988), one volume of articles on text linguistic aspects (see Carstens & Hubbard (eds.) 1993), a few doctoral theses (eg. Wybenga 1983, Hubbard 1989, Lotter 1992) and some M.A. dissertations (see Steenberg 1986, Beukes 1989, Esterhuizen 1991, Van Niekerk 1992, Wessels 1993b, Pretorius 1994). Textual aspects have however been explored in quite a few articles - see for example Aldridge (1984), Botha (1986), Branford (1993), Carstens (1987, 1991, 1992c, 1993, 1994), Esterhuizen & Wybenga (1993), Feinauer (1987, 1989b), H.C. Groenewald (1985), Hubbard (1981, 1990, 1993), Krüger (1986a, 1986b, 1986c, 1988), Lombard (1993), Louw (1982, 1987), Louwrens (1981, 1983), Ohlhoff (1983a, 1983b), Ponelis (1975, 1978, 1992), Van der Merwe (1993), Van Niekerk (1993), Visser & Weideman (1986), Weideman (1984), Wessels (1993a), Wilkes (1983), Wybenga (1987, 1993).

In contrast with these directly textual-orientated sources there are other sources in which textual aspects were only incidentally involved but which are nevertheless important for textual research as such - see for example Botha (1983), Coetzee (1982), Du Plessis (1983), Du Plooy (1992a, 1992b, 1992c), Feinauer (1989a), P.S. Groenewald (1987, 1990), Jenkinson (1982, 1987), Louwrens (1989), Prinsloo (1993), Sekhukhune (1986, 1990), Swanepoel (1989), Van Rensburg (1967), Von Gruenewaldt (1992).

A close look at these sources reveals that textual research has been approached in a sort of hit-and-run way and that a really sound and consistent theoretical basis is lacking. It seems that at certain stages the works of researchers like Halliday & Hasan (1976) or De Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) had an influence on the research produced - Halliday & Hasan's book *Cohesion in English* (1976), for example, led to output such as Carstens (1981), Hubbard (1989), Krüger (1986a, 1986b, 1986c, 1988), Steenberg (1986), Visser & Weideman (1986), Weideman (1984). It further appears that De Beaugrande & Dressler's book *Introduction to Text Linguistics* (1981) was a kind of milestone for SA textual research, and this mainly because it gave certain distinctive criteria for establishing the acceptability of a text. They namely advocated that a text is "...a communicative occurence which meets seven standards of textuality" (De Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 3), namely cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, contextuality and intertextuality. In a certain sense they implied with this definition that a text is larger than for example the piece of paper it has been written on or the words that are pronounced in a relevant situation - it also involves pragmatic aspects which make it possible to determine why a certain chunk of language is accepted as a communicative unit in a certain communication context. This broad application has made it possible for researchers to approach a text in different ways and especially in ways related to personal research interests. Suddenly it was possible, for example, to study reference relations, conjunctions, the lexical relations between words in texts, causality, temporal aspects, intonation, etc. from a identified theoretical basis. According to the total research output since the publication of this book it is quite clear that De Beaugrande & Dressler's theoretical model and method became the most used model and method for textual research in SA as it provided the necessary framework for doing relevant research.

In the next section more attention will be given to what De Beaugrande & Dressler's 'standards of textuality' actually entail and what the nature and extent of SA research on these standards are.

## 4. APPROACHES TO THE 'STANDARDS OF TEXTUALITY'

### 4.1 **The 'standards of textuality'**

I assume that the above mentioned 'standards of textuality' as presented by De Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) is not entirely unknown to the audience, but nevertheless will give a short summary of what is meant by each standard.

* COHESION has to do with the way in which formal surface features (syntax and lexis) help to achieve unity in a text - according to Fitzgerald & Spiegel (1986: 263) here we have to do with "...specific linguistic links creating connections between sentences". Five major ways (the "linguistic links") by means of sets of markers are used to establish cohesive relationships ("connections") in a text: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion.

* COHERENCE is probably the most important standard as it has to do with the way in which a text are understood and accepted as a communicative occurence. It links the textual world with the extratextual world and makes the text relevant. De Beaugrande (1980: 9) in this regard refers to coherence as "...conceptual connectivity: how underlying concepts and relations are put together". Yang (1989: 235) adds that "(c)oherence...is partly based on the interconnections with the text and partly on the mind of the reader who constantly relates the text to its extratextual situation".

* INTENTIONALITY and ACCEPTABILITY focus on the parts the participants in a communicative occurence have to play in order to make sense of the text. The producer of the text must have the intention to produce a coherent text that will attain some communicative goal. On the other hand the receiver of the text must be willing to accept the text as performing some communicative purpose.

* INFORMATIVITY has to do with the way in which the elements in sentences (i.e. words and clauses) are used in sentences to carry certain communicative values. It "...concerns the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected vs. unexpected or known vs. unknown/certain" (De Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 8-9).

* CONTEXTUALITY ("situationality" in De Beaugrande & Dressler's terms) concerns the way in which knowledge of the real-world context helps the text participants to assess the relevance of a text in that particular context. Bell (1991: 171) says "...it is crucially important for the assessment of the appropriateness of a text to know where it occurred and what its function was in that situation".

* INTERTEXTUALITY refers to the relationships that exist between a particular text and certain other texts which share some features with it. De Beaugrande & Dressler (1981: 10) say this standard "...concerns the

factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts".

Bell (1991: 163-164) says these standards have been proposed in order to answer a number of key questions which will have to be asked about a text:

* How do the clauses hold together? (*Cohesion*)
* How do the propositions hold together? (*Coherence*)
* Why did the speaker/writer produce this? (*Intentionality*)
* How does the reader take it? (*Acceptability*)
* What does it tell us? (*Informativity*)
* What is the text for? (*Contextuality/Relevance*)
* What other texts does one resemble? (*Intertextuality*)

If one is able to give answers to these questions you would have acquired a lot of knowledge on the way language works and on the way people use language to communicate effectively.

## 4.2 **Research on the standards in SA**

What has been done towards these standards in SA? Carstens (1987) gives a short overview of what these standards actually imply and then argues that all the standards are not relevant and necessary for a text to be considered as a coherent text because cohesion is not an essential feature of textuality (cf. also Brown & Yule 1983: 194-199). Wybenga (1988: 36) and Hubbard (1989) shortly refer to these standards in their publications but do not give an in-depth discussion of all the standards.

The total research output on textual aspects shows an interesting pattern: one namely has to distinguish between **direct** and **indirect** research because not all the sources involved had the intention of doing textual research; in many cases this can only incidentally be used for studying a text. This means that the actual extent of the relevant research is much more limited than may be inferred from the following discussion and the accompanying diagramme.

It seems clear that COHESION and COHERENCE received the most attention in textual studies and that the other five standards were treated much less favourably. COHESION - especially after Halliday & Hasan's *Cohesion in English* (1976) - has been relatively well explored (eg. in Wybenga 1988: 37-52) but here again only some of the mechanisms creating cohesive ties were investigated. It seems that **reference** was relatively well explored in the 1980's by researchers (see for example Carstens 1976, 1981, 1984, 1985a, 1985b, 1986a; Hubbard 1989; Visser & Weideman 1986; Weideman 1984) but that again in the most instances it was studied from the perspective of the *phenomenon* reference and not because of its value for textual connectivity.

**Lexical cohesion** only received attention in a few studies - some from the perspective of Halliday & Hasan (1976), eg. Steenberg (1986) who researched the role of lexical repetition in some Afrikaans short stories, and some from the perspective of Hoey (1991), eg. Wessels (1993a, 1993b) who tried to determine bonding patterns in expository texts. De Stadler's work on *Afrikaanse Semantiek* (1989) only had indirect value for lexical cohesion. **Conjunction** as textual phenomenon was mainly researched by Hubbard (1989) in his thesis and by Wybenga ((ed.) 1989) in his introductory work for foreign language speakers. It also received some attention in African languages such as Northern Sotho and Setswana (cf. Krüger 1986b, 1988; Lombard 1993) and also in the work of Feinauer (1987b, 1989a, 1989b) who mainly looked at its function as discourse markers in informal spoken texts.

**Ellipsis** and **substitution** did not receive much attention as textual phenomena in local research - the only source mentionable in this regard is Wybenga ((ed.) 1989). In other studies - eg. by Gouws (1977, 1982, 1984), Ponelis (1979) - again the phenomena were researched but these studies seldom had direct relevance for textual studies.

COHERENCE was approached in a few studies, eg. by Hubbard (1989, 1990, 1993) who tried to establish the basis of coherence in expository texts, by Aldridge (1984) who tried to determine the linguistic basis for coherence and by Wybenga (1987) who concentrated on the role the hearer played in determining the coherence of a text. Wybenga also made a few remarks about coherence in his 1988 book on *Diskoersanalise en Stilistiek*.

The other five standards (i.e. INTENTIONALITY, ACCEPTABILITY, INFORMATIVITY, CONTEXTUALITY and INTERTEXTUALITY) were seldom directly involved in textual research. It is true that a lot of the work that had been done in syntax, semantics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics and literary theory will have relevance for these standards but it has to be inferred from the actual study. Feinauer (1987) for example made mention of informativity structures in her doctoral thesis on word order in Afrikaans; Carstens (1986) wrote an article on the contextual approach to language study and also published some articles (1992a, 1992b) on the influence of the context on sociolinguistic studies; Sekhukhune (1986, 1990) referred to the role of the context in texts in Northern Sotho; Van Niekerk (1992) made mention of the role discourse markers played in the deployment of discourse. Intertextuality was only mentioned in literature studies - from a linguistic point of view nothing has been done.

In other sources efforts were made to tackle some of the biggest problems in a study of texts, for example: what text linguistics as research area actually entails (cf. Carstens 1993, Ponelis 1975); what is meant by "text" when used in the term "text linguistics" (cf. Carstens (1991b; also H.C. Groenewald 1985); intonation and discourse (Esterhuizen 1991; Esterhuizen & Wybenga 1993;

Gräbe 1992b, 1992c, 1992d); temporal aspects in discourse (cf. Swanepoel 1989; Wybenga 1983, 1993); causality and discourse (cf. Pretorius 1994). Wilkes (1983) tried to explain what Van Dijk's (1972) theory of text grammar meant in practical terms and Du Plooy (1986) gave a critisism of this theory in her book about narrative theory in the 20th century.

Mention was made in some studies about the relationship between the study of literature and the study of linguistics. Carstens (1992c) tried to explain what implications the study of text linguistics might have for the study of literature and Botha (1983), Coetzee (1982), Du Plessis (1983), Gräbe (1984, 1992a, 1992e), Hubbard (1981), Ohlhoff (1983a, 1983b, 1985), and some others gave supportive arguments in this regard. Text types/genres were approached in a few studies but also seldom from a real textual perspective. Wybenga (1988: 22-24, 33-34) made reference to the ways genres can be studied in language and the effect it might have on the structure of texts, Kroes (1981, 1986) tried to give a typology of text from the perspective of translation, P.S. Groenewald (1987, 1990) had something to say about text types in Northern Sotho and De Bruyn (1994) tried to study the structure of the joke text from a pragmatic perspective.

The above mentioned information can be summarised in the following diagrammes. They should give a good idea what had already been done towards textual research in SA.

**Diagramme A: The general picture**

| TOPIC OF THE RESEARCH | SOURCES | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Direct** | **Indirect** |
| What is text linguistics? | Carstens 1993<br>Hubbard 1989 | |
| What is the "text"? | Carstens 1991b | Groenewald 1985<br>Du Plooy 1992a, 1992d<br>Johl 1992 |
| What are the "standards of textuality"? | Carstens 1987<br>Hubbard 1989<br>De Bruyn 1994<br>Wybenga 1988 | Branford 1993 |
| COHESION | | |
| * In general | Krüger 1986a<br>Wybenga 1988 | Hilton 1993 |
| * *Reference* | Carstens 1976, 1981, 1984, 1985b<br>Hubbard 1989<br>Visser & Weideman 1986 | Carstens 1985a, 1986a<br>A. Carstens 1984<br>De Stadler 1989<br>J.P. Botha 1985 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Weideman 1984<br>Krüger 1986c<br>Louwrens 1983 | W.J. Botha 1980, 1982, 1990<br>De Klerk 1978<br>De Villiers 1975, 1983<br>C. du Plessis 1984, 1985<br>H. du Plessis 1982<br>Gouws 1982<br>Grieshaber 1977<br>Jenkinson 1982, 1987<br>Laubscher 1978<br>Odendal 1950<br>*Ponelis 1979*<br>Prinsloo 1982<br>Scholtz 1966<br>Van Rensburg 1976<br>Venter 1976 |
| * | *Lexical cohesion* | Steenberg 1986<br>Wessels 1993a, 1993b<br>Wybenga (ed.) 1989 | De Stadler 1989<br>De Klerk 1978<br>Louwrens 1989<br>Van Heerden 1965 |
| * | *Conjunction* | Hubbard 1989<br><br>Krüger 1986b<br>Lombard 1993<br>Wybenga 1988<br>Wybenga (ed.) 1989 | Feinauer 1987b, 1989, 1990<br>Krüger 1988<br>Van der Merwe 1993 |
| * | *Ellipsis* | | Botha 1985<br>Gouws 1977, 1982, 1984<br>*Ponelis 1979*<br>Wybenga 1988 |
| * | *Substitution* | | Botha 1985<br>*Ponelis 1979*<br>Wybenga 1988 |
| | COHERENCE | Aldridge 1984<br>Hubbard 1989, 1990, 1993<br>Wybenga 1987, 1988 | Beukes 1989<br>Louw 1984, 1987<br>Van Niekerk 1992, 1993 |
| | INTENTIONALITY and ACCEPTABILITY | | Retief 1979<br>Van der Riet 1984<br>Van Niekerk 1992, 1993<br>Van Jaarsveld (ed.) 1982, 1987 |
| | INFORMATIVITY | | De Bruyn 1992<br>Feinauer 1987a<br>Louwrens 1981<br>Ponelis 1979 |
| | CONTEXTUALITY | Carstens 1986b | Carstens 1992a, 1992b<br>Sekhukhune 1986, 1990<br>Sinclair 1992 |
| | INTERTEXTUALITY | | Degenaar 1988 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Du Plooy 1990<br>Hambidge 1986, 1992a<br>Malan 1986, 1992<br>Pieterse 1986 |
| Intonation and discourse | Esterhuizen 1991<br>Esterhuizen & Wybenga 1993 | Gräbe 1992b, 1992c, 1992d |
| Causality | Pretorius 1994 | |
| Discourse and temporal aspects | Swanepoel 1989<br>Wybenga 1983, 1993 | |
| Text grammar | Wilkes 1983 | Du Plooy 1986, 1992b |
| Text types | De Bruyn 1994<br>Wybenga 1988 | Groenewald 1987, 1990<br>Hambidge 1992b<br>Du Plooy 1992g<br>Kroes 1981, 1986<br>Opland 1992<br>Prinsloo 1987<br>Theron 1992, 1993 |
| LINGUISTICS and LITERATURE | | |
| * In general | Senekal (ed.) 1986 | Cloete e.a. (eds.) 1985 |
| * Stylistics and linguistics | Hellinga & Scholtz 1955<br>Van Rensburg 1992 | Van Rensburg 1967 |
| * Linguistics and the study of literature | Botha 1983<br>Coetzee 1982<br>Du Plessis 1983<br>Hubbard 1981<br>Liebenberg 1983<br>Ohlhoff 1983a, 1983b, 1985<br>Von Gruenewaldt 1992 | |
| * Implications of TL for the study of literature | Carstens 1992c | |
| * Syntax and poetry | Gräbe 1984, 1992a, 1992e<br>Gräbe (ed.) 1984 | |
| * Semiotics and text | Louw 1982, 1987<br>Viljoen 1986 | Du Plooy 1992e |
| * Story grammars | Du Plooy 1986, 1992f | |

If you only take a look at the Afrikaans contribution the picture really looks bleak:

**Diagramme B: The Afrikaans picture**

| TOPIC OF THE RESEARCH | SOURCES | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Direct** | **Indirect** |
| What is text linguistics? | Carstens 1993 | |
| What is the "text"? | Carstens 1991b | Du Plooy 1992a, 1992d<br>Johl 1992 |
| What are the "standards of textuality"? | Carstens 1987<br>De Bruyn 1994<br>Wybenga 1988 | |
| COHESION | | |
| * In general | Wybenga 1988 | |
| * *Reference* | Carstens 1976, 1981, 1984, 1985b<br>Visser & Weideman 1986<br>Weideman 1984 | Carstens 1985a, 1986a<br>A. Carstens 1984<br>De Stadler 1989<br>J.P. Botha 1985<br>W.J. Botha 1980, 1982, 1990<br>De Klerk 1978<br>De Villiers 1975, 1983<br>C. du Plessis 1984, 1985<br>H. du Plessis 1982<br>Gouws 1982<br>Grieshaber 1977<br>Jenkinson 1982, 1987<br>Laubscher 1978<br>Odendal 1950<br>*Ponelis 1979*<br>Prinsloo 1982<br>Scholtz 1966<br>Van Rensburg 1976<br>Venter 1976 |
| * *Lexical cohesion* | Steenberg 1986<br>Wybenga (ed.) 1989 | De Stadler 1989<br>De Klerk 1978<br>Van Heerden 1965 |
| * *Conjunction* | Wybenga 1988<br>Wybenga (ed.) 1989 | Feinauer 1987b, 1989a, 1989b<br>Van der Merwe 1993 |
| * *Ellipsis* | | Botha 1985<br>Gouws 1977, 1982, 1984<br>*Ponelis 1979*<br>Wybenga 1988 |
| * *Substitution* | | Botha 1985<br>*Ponelis 1979*<br>Wybenga 1988 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| COHERENCE | Wybenga 1987, 1988 | Beukes 1989<br>Louw 1984, 1987<br>Van Niekerk 1992, 1993 |
| INTENTIONALITY and ACCEPTABILITY | | Retief 1979<br>Van der Riet 1984<br>Van Niekerk 1992, 1993<br>Van Jaarsveld (ed.) 1982, 1987 |
| INFORMATIVITY | | De Bruyn 1992<br>Feinauer 1987a<br>Ponelis 1979 |
| CONTEXTUALITY | Carstens 1986b | Carstens 1992a, 1992b |
| INTERTEXTUALITY | | Degenaar 1988<br>Du Plooy 1990<br>Hambidge 1986, 1992a<br>Malan 1986, 1992<br>Pieterse 1986 |
| Intonation and discourse | Esterhuizen 1991<br>Esterhuizen & Wybenga 1993 | Gräbe 1992b, 1992c, 1992d |
| Causality | | |
| Discourse and temporal aspects | Wybenga 1983, 1993 | |
| Text grammar | Wilkes 1983 | Du Plooy 1986, 1992b |
| Text types | De Bruyn 1994<br>Wybenga 1988 | Hambidge 1992b<br>Du Plooy 1992g<br>Kroes 1981, 1986<br>Opland 1992<br>Prinsloo 1987<br>Theron 1992, 1993 |
| LINGUISTICS and LITERATURE | | |
| * In general | Senekal (ed.) 1986 | Cloete e.a. (eds.) 1985 |
| * Stylistics and linguistics | Hellinga & Scholtz 1955<br>Van Rensburg 1992 | Van Rensburg 1967 |
| * Linguistics and the study of literature | Botha 1983<br>Du Plessis 1983<br>Liebenberg 1983<br>Ohlhoff 1983a, 1983b, 1985 | |
| * Implications of TL for the study of literature | Carstens 1992c | |
| * Syntax and poetry | Gräbe 1984, 1992a, | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1992e<br>Gräbe (ed.) 1984 | |
| * | Semiotics and text | Louw 1982, 1987<br>Viljoen 1986 | Du Plooy 1992e |
| * | Story grammars | Du Plooy 1986, 1992f | |

## 4.3 **Research implications for text linguistics**

Carstens (1993: 9) indicated that the standards of textuality do have certain implications for textual research. These implications comprise some of the areas - see below - that should be considered when research into textual aspects is undertaken.

* The grammatical levels that are involved in the analysis of a text: syntax, semantics, morphology, phonology.
* The linguistic features of a text.
* The salient structure of a text: why does one text differ from another?
* The integration of the lexico-grammatical elements in a text: how does this happen?
* The communicative function of texts: how is the text related to the larger environment? Is there a relation between the function and structure of a text?
* Research into language users' willingness to participate in communication by means of a text?
* The knowledge that is shared when language users communicate: knowledge about the presuppositions in the text, the ways (direct, indirect) in which information is given/provided in a text, the different cultures and social backgrounds that exist, etc.
* The influence different contexts have on the interpretation of texts.
* What text types/genres exist and what is the linguistic basis of each text type? What are the distinctive features of each text type?
* Research into the interdisciplinary nature of text linguistics: how is/was text linguistics influenced by other related disciplines? Can text linguistics influence other disciplines? Will the results and output of text linguistic research have any value for other disciplines?
* Text linguistic theory must be further developed: for instance, attempts should be made to define the concept of "text linguistics" in a more refined way.
* Determine useful methods to analyse texts in an easier way.

A study that includes any one of these aspects - and certainly there are a lot more that could be added here - will help to provide more insight in what is probably one of the most important aspects of textual research: the **textual competence** of language users, i.e. their ability to form and understand texts.

A question that can be asked with reference to these aspects is: in what way have these aspects been researched in SA? A quick glance at diagrammes A and B will reveal that there are many gaps in the total research output and that only a few of these aspects received some attention. To illustrate this point: the grammatical levels (like syntax, semantics, phonology) have been dealt with in some sources but seldom in a thorough way - up till now nothing has been done on the morphological aspect of cohesion. Scant attention had been given to aspects such as the definite structure of a text, the communicative function of a text, the context in which a text operates, the determining of methods for doing text analysis, text types, the interdisciplinary nature of text linguistics' research, the formulation of a SA version of text linguistic theory, the practical use of text research (i.e. what you can do with the results of your research, eg. how will the theory and methods of text linguistics benefit language teaching), etc. In a few studies the pragmatic nature of a text has been exploited (cf. De Bruyn 1994, Sekhukhune 1986, 1990) but again not in a direct text related way as is so often the case.

## 5. CONCLUSION

It is clear that the study of a text from a linguistic point of view still has a long way to go. Some important aspects have been researched but then mostly from a certain perspective that only had incidental value for textual research. It is difficult to say that textual research in SA has been approached in an organized way - it can be much rather said that it was done in an exploratory way and that this necessarily brings about a bit of disorganization. It further seems as if Afrikaans text linguistic research cannot be ignored when looking at the total picture in SA but that on the other side it still has to be developed much more in the years ahead. Text research has many advantages and presents exciting opportunities for research - these must only be seized.

.....

## REFERENCES

Aldridge, M.V. 1984. The linguistic basis of coherence. *LSSA Conference Papers* 1984: 1-15.

Barkhuizen, J.H. e.a. (eds.) 1992. *Hupomnema - Feesbundel opgedra aan prof. J.P. Louw.* Pretoria: Dept. of Greek, University of Pretoria.

Beukes, M.P. 1989. *Vooropstelling, kohesie en koherensie in die poësie van T.T. Cloete.* Unpublished M.A. dissertation, PU for CHE, Potchefstroom.

Botha, J. 1986. 'n Hamer, 'n saag en 'n skroewedraaier - oor metodes van ontleding van die Griekse teks van die Nuwe Testament. *Koers* 51(3): 328-368.

Botha, J.P. 1985. *Afrikaanse Sintaksis vir Voorgraadse Studente*. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill.

Botha, R.P. 1983. Wat kan Taalwetenskap die student van literatuur bied? In: Sinclair, M. (ed.) 1983: 1-24.

Botha, R.P. e.a. (reds.) 1992. *Taalwetenskap vir die Taalprofessies I*. Stellenbosch: Dept. of General Linguistics, University of Stellenbosch.

Botha, W.J. 1980. *Die Grammatika van die Eerste Persoon*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, UNISA.

Botha, W.J. 1982. Besitlike konstruksies en die eerste persoon. *LSSA Conference Papers* 1982: 25-35.

Botha, W.J. 1990. Deiktiese tydsverwysing. *Acta Academica* 22(3): 102-115.

Branford, W. 1993. Textuality: some classical Japanese Haiku and the non-Japanese reader. In: Von Staden, P.M.S. e.a. (eds.) 1993: 12-20.

Brink, A.P. 1978. *Vertelkunde. 'n Inleiding tot die lees van verhalende tekste*. Pretoria/Cape Town: Academica.

Brown, G. & G. Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carstens, A. 1984. Verwysing - betekenisteorie of taalfunksie? *LSSA Conference Papers* 1984: 130-143.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1976. *Aspekte van taalkundige verwysing - 'n verkenning*. Mini-dissertation for the M.A. degree, University of Stellenbosch.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1977. Anaforiese eilande in Afrikaans. *Taalfasette* 22(4): 29-57.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1979. Slap identiteit: 'n Identiteitsprobleem. *Taalfasette* 26(2): 28-58.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1981. Oor taalkundige verwysing. *LSSA Conference Papers* 1981: 33-45.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1984. *'n Kontekstuele Analise van Afrikaanse Bepaalde Voornaamwoorde*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Stellenbosch.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1985a. Pragmaties beheerde anafore? *SA Journal for Linguistics* 3(2): 1-15.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1985b. Verwysing, bepaalde voornaamwoorde en die konteks. *LSSA Conference Papers* 1985: 54-63.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1986a. Moontlike benaderings tot 'n studie van die Afrikaanse bepaalde voornaamwoord. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe* 26(2): 107-124.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1986b. Die kontekstuele benadering tot taalstudies. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 4(2): 1-18.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1987. De Beaugrande en Dressler (1981) se 'standaarde van tekstualiteit'. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 5(2): 17-32.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1991. 'Teks' - 'n begrip op soek na 'n funksionele tekslinguistiese definisie. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 9(4):85-90.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Carstens, W.A.M. 1992a. Inleiding tot die sosiolinguistiek II: Die konteks as bepalende faktor in die sosiolinguistiek. *Journal for Language Teaching* 26(1): 32-40. April 1992.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1992b. Inleiding tot die sosiolinguistiek III: Die invloed van die pragmatiese konteks op sosiolinguistiese studies. *Journal for Language Teaching* 26(2): 63-74. July 1992.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1992c. Het die tekslinguistiek enige implikasies vir die studie van literatuur? *Literator* 13(2): 76-84. August 1992.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1993. Die studieterrein van die tekslinguistiek. In: Carstens, W.A.M. & E.H. Hubbard (eds.) 1993: 1-15.

Carstens, W.A.M. 1994. Enkele tendense in die ontwikkeling van die tekslinguistiek. (In press.)

Carstens, W.A.M. & E.H. Hubbard (eds.) 1993. Tekslinguistiek/Text Linguistics. *SA Journal for Linguistics*, Supplement 15. May 1993.

Cilliers, L. & A.H. Snyman (eds.) 1987. *Varia Studia - in honorem W.J. Richards. Acta Academica*. Series B, No. 22. UOFS, Bloemfontein.

Cloete, T.T. 1992. Taalhandelinge en die literatuur. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 525-530.

Cloete, T.T.; E. Botha & C. Malan (eds.) 1985. *Gids by die Literatuurstudie*. Pretoria: HAUM-Literêr.

Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992. *Literêre Terme en Teorieë*. Pretoria: HAUM-Literêr.

Coetzee, J.M. 1982. Linguistics and literature. In: Ryan, R. & S. van Zyl (eds.) 1982: 41-52.

De Beaugrande, R.A. 1980. *Text, Discourse, and Process: Toward a Multidisciplinary Science of Texts*. (Vol. IV in the series *Advances in Discourse Process*.) Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

De Beaugrande, R.A. 1984. *Text Production: Toward a Science of Composition*. (Vol. XI in the series *Advances in Discourse Processes*.) Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

De Beaugrande, R.A. 1985. Text Linguistics in discourse studies. In: Van Dijk, T.A. (ed.) 1985: 41-70.

De Beaugrande, R.A. & W.U. Dressler 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.

De Bruyn, P.S. 1992. Die aard van ou en nuwe informasie in die grapteks. *SA Journal for Linguistics*, Supplement 13: 59-74.

De Bruyn, P.S. 1994. Die grapteks met verwysing na die interessantheidsbeginsel. *Literator* 15(2): 1-17.

Degenaar, J. 1988. Intertekstualiteit. Paper read at the ALV conference, Potchefstroom, September 1988.

Dekker, G. 1951. 'n Stilistiese ondersoek. *Standpunte* 19(3).

De Klerk, W.J. 1978. *Inleiding tot die Semantiek*. Durban: Butterworth.

De Stadler, L.G. 1989. *Afrikaanse Semantiek*. Johannesburg: Southern Books.

De Villiers, M. 1975. *Die semantiek van Afrikaans*. Cape Town: HAUM.

De Villiers, M. 1983. *Afrikaanse Grammatika vir Volwassenes*. Cape Town: Nasou.

De Wit, H.E.D. & R.M. Ntuli 1994. Die bevordering van natuurlike diskoers en kommunikatiewe kompetensie in die Afrikatale. *SA Journal for African Languages* 14(1): 1-14.

Du Plessis, C. 1984. *Die mededinging tussen die manlike en vroulike voornaamwoorde in Afrikaans*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of the Orange Free State, Bloemfontein.

Du Plessis, C. 1985. Is dit nou *hy* of is dit nou *sy*? *SA Journal for Linguistics* 3(3): 1-20.

Du Plessis, H. 1982. *Sintaksis vir Eerstejaars*. Pretoria/Cape Town: Academica.

Du Plessis, H. 1983. Die verband tussen taal- en letterkunde. In: Sinclair, A.J.L. (ed.) 1983: 157-166.

Du Plooy, H. 1986. *Verhaalteorie in die twintigste eeu*. Durban: Butterworth.

Du Plooy, H. 1990. Die polifoniese gesprek - intertekstualiteit as leesmodus. *Stilet* 2(2): 1-14.

Du Plooy, H. 1992a. Diskoers. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 78-79.

Du Plooy, H. 1992b. Mikrostruktuur/Makrostruktuur/ Superstruktuur. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 306-308.

Du Plooy, H. 1992c. Narratologie. 331-333.

Du Plooy, H. 1992d. Oop en geslote tekste. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 356-357.

Du Plooy, H. 1992e. Semiotiek. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 473-476.

Du Plooy, H. 1992f. Storiegrammatika. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 506-508.

Du Plooy, H. 1992g. Vertelling. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 566-567.

Du Plooy, H. & H. Viljoen 1992. Benaderingswyses in die literatuurwetenskap. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 25-38.

Du Plooy, H. 1993. Die narratologie in die kontemporêre Suid-Afrikaanse literatuurstudie. In: *SAVAL Conference Papers* 12: 107-128. Potchefstroom, March 1993.

Eksteen, L.C. & R. Pretorius (eds.) 1983. *Afrikaans: Objek en Metode*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Esterhuizen, M. 1991. *Intonasie as kodewisselingstrategie by die aanleer van Afrikaans deur swart studente - 'n Etnolinguistiese ondersoek*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, PU for CHE, Potchefstroom.

Esterhuizen, M. & D.M. Wybenga 1993. Intonasie en diskoers. In: Carstens, W.A.M. & E.H. Hubbard (eds.) 1993: 107-121.

Feinauer, A.E. 1987a. *Sinsvolgorde in Afrikaans*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Stellenbosch.

Feinauer, A.E. 1987b. Die aanloop as tekstuele verbindingsmiddel. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe* 28(4): 327-335.

Feinauer, A.E. 1989. Adjunkplasing in Afrikaanse spreektaal. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe* 29(2): 79-93. Junie 1989.

Feinauer, A.E. 1990. Tekstuele binding in gesproke Afrikaans. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 8(2): 75-79.

Fitzgerald, J. & D.L. Spiegel 1986. Textual cohesion and coherence in children's writing. *Research in the Teaching of English* 20(3): 263-281.

Fourie, P.J. 1992. Diskoersontleding as 'n metode in die sosiale wetenskappe. *Communicatio* 18(1): 19-28.

Gouws, J.A. 1982. *Die wederkerende konstruksie*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, UNISA, Pretoria.

Gouws, R.H. 1977. *Die skrapping van identieke woorddele in Afrikaans*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Stellenbosch.

Gouws, R.H. 1982. *Die skrapping van identieke stukke in Afrikaanse neweskikkings-konstruksies*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Stellenbosch.

Gouws, R.H. 1984. Die meerkonjunkige neweskikkingskonstruksie as skrappingstuk. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 2(3): 37-54. July 1984.

Gräbe, I. 1984. *Aspekte van poëtiese taalgebruik: teoretiese verkenning en toepassing*. Potchefstroom: Dept. of Central Publications, PU for CHE, Potchefstroom.

Gräbe, I. 1992a. Linguistiese ondersoek en gediganalise: noodwendige verstrengeling of marginale oorvleueling? In: Botha, R.P. e.a. (eds.) 1992: 17-38.

Gräbe, I. 1992b. Generatiewe metrum. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 145-148.

Gräbe, I. 1992c. Klank. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 204-207.

Gräbe, I. 1992d. Ritme (in die poësie). In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 430-432.

Gräbe, I. 1992e. Sintaksis (van die poësie). In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 489-493.

Gräbe, I. (ed.) 1984. *Sintaksis in die Poësie*. University of Port Elizabeth. Research publication C21.

Grieshaber, N.J. 1977. Refleksivering, oorganklikheid en refleksiefwerkwoorde. *Taalfasette* 22(2): 52-64.

Groenewald, H.C. 1985. The nature of the traditional text. *SA Journal for African Languages* 5(1): 1-3.

Groenewald, P.S. 1987. Noord-Sotho: 'n Genre-indeling. *SA Journal for African Languages* 7(4): 111-117.

Groenewald, P.S. 1990. Verhaalkategorieë in Noord-Sotho. *SA Journal for African Languages* 10(3): 93-97.

Grové, A.P. (ed.) 1975. *In en om die Letterkunde*. Cape Town: HAUM.

Halliday, M.A.K. & R. Hasan 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hambidge, J. 1986. Intertekstualiteit versus inter-tekstualiteit. *Standpunte* 183: 35-43. June 1986.

Hambidge, J. 1992a. Genre. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 148-150.

Hambidge, J. 1992b. Tekstualiteit. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 531-532.

Hellinga, W.G. & H. van der M. Scholtz 1955. *Kreatiewe analise van taalgebruik: prinsipes van stilistiek op linguistiese grondslag*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Hilton, J. 1993. Cohesion in Latin. *SA Journal for Linguistics*, Supplement 15: 41-54.

Hoey, M. 1991. *Patterns of lexis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hubbard, E.H. 1981. The role of linguistics in the study of literary texts. In: Maxwell-Mahon, W.D. (ed.) 1981: 110-125.

Hubbard, E.H. 1989. *Reference Cohesion, Conjunctive Cohesion and Relational Coherence in Student Academic Writing*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, UNISA, Pretoria.

Hubbard, E.H. 1990. Topical structure analysis as a text-linguistic explication of "coherence": A critique. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 8(2): 80-87.

Hubbard, E.H. 1993. Some coherence correlates in expository writing. *SA Journal for Linguistics*, Supplement 15: 55-74.

Jenkinson, A.G. 1982. As ek jy is en jy is hy, wie's ons? In: Van Jaarsveld, G.J. (ed.) 1982: 99-126.

Jenkinson, A.G. 1987. Aspekte van voornaamwoorde en verwysing in taalhandelinge. In: Van Jaarsveld, G.J. (ed.) 1987: 51-74.

Johl, R. 1992. Teks en konteks. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 530-531.

Jordaan, G.J.C. 1986. 'n Kritiese evaluering van die Suid-Afrikaanse diskoersanalise. *Koers* 51(3): 401-418.

Kroes, G. 1981. Die rol van vorm in die vertaling van referensiële tekste. *The Language Practitioner* 1981(4): 17-40.

Kroes, G. 1986. 'n Vertaalstrategie vir referensiële tekste. *The Language Practitioner* 1986(2): 26-45.

Krüger, C.J.H. 1986a. Semantic relations. *SA Journal for African languages* 6(1): 29-33.

Krüger, C.J.H. 1986b. Tussensinse semantiese relasies. *SA Journal for African languages* 6(3): 105-102.

Krüger, C.J.H. 1986c. Non-structural (anaphoric) semantic relations with reference to Tswana. *SA Journal for African Languages* 6(4): 152-155.

Krüger, C.J.H. 1988. Comparison between co-ordination and other semantic relations in Setswana. *SA Journal for African Languages* 8(4): 131-138.

Laubscher, A. 1978. *Aspekte van die refleksiewe werkwoorde in Afrikaans*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Stellenbosch.

Liebenberg, W. 1983. Die rol van die taalwetenskap in die ontwikkeling van die literatuur-wetenskap. In: Sinclair, M. (ed.) 1983: 31-43.

Lombard, D.P. 1993. Conjunctions in Northern-Sotho. In: Von Staden, P.M.S. e.a. (eds.) 1993: 88-97.

Louw, J.P. 1982. 'n Semiotiese benadering tot diskoersanalise. *LSSA Conference Papers* 1982: 170-183.

Louw, J.P. 1984. Hoe lees en verstaan ons? *LSSA Conference Papers* 1984: 408-411.

Louw, J.P. 1987. Metodologie vir die lees van 'n teks. In: Cilliers, L. & A. H. Snyman (eds.) 1987: 115-127.

Louwrens, L.J. 1981. The relevance of the notions "given" and "new" discourse information in the study of Northern-Sotho syntax. *SA Journal for African Languages* 1(1): 21-49.

Louwrens, L.J. 1983. Definiteness and indefiniteness in Northern-Sotho. *SA Journal for African Languages* 3(1): 23-41.

Louwrens, L.J. 1989. Antonymy. *SA Journal for African Languages* 9(1): 19-22.

Malan, R. 1986. **Komas uit 'n bamboesstok** *van D.J. Opperman en die struktuuranalitiese konsep van intertekstualiteit.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg.

Malan, R. 1992. Intertekstualiteit. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 187-189.

Malmkjaer, K. (ed.) 1991. *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. London/New York: Routledge.

Maxwell-Mahon, W.D. (ed.) 1981. *Critical Theory and Literary Texts*. Pretoria: UNISA.

Newmeyer, F. (ed.) 1988. *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey. Vol. 2 - Linguistic Theory: Extensions and Implications*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Odendal, F.F. 1950. *Aspekte van die pronominale aanduiding by mense, diere, in animate en abstrakte in Afrikaans*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Stellenbosch.

Ohlhoff, H. 1983a. 'n Brug tussen taalwetenskap en letterkunde: die bydrae van die taalwetenskap tot literatuuronderrig. In: Eksteen, L.C. & R. Pretorius (eds.) 1983: 169-177.

Ohlhoff, C.H.F. 1983b. Teks, teks en...teks. In: Sinclair, A.J.L. (ed.) 1983: 389-396.

Ohlhoff, C.H.F. 1985. *Taalkundige Insigte en Literêre Tekste*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pretoria.

Opland, J. 1992. Mondelinge literatuur. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 320-325

Pieterse, H.J. 1986. *Die betekenis en funksie van die verwysings in* **Die Ambassadeur** *van André P. Brink, met toespitsing op die* **Divina Commedia** *van Dante Alighieri.* Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Pretoria.

Ponelis, F.A. 1975. Gedagtes oor teksontleding. In: Grové, A.P. (ed.) 1975: 91-99.

Ponelis, F.A. 1978. Sinsanaforiese 'dit' in Afrikaans. *Koers* 43(1): 55-62.

Ponelis, F.A. 1979. *Afrikaanse Sintaksis*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Ponelis, F.A. 1992. Cohesion in Afrikaans propositional phrases with 'locative' complements. In: Barkhuizen, J.H. et al. (eds.) 1992: 188-194.

Pretorius, E.J. 1994. *A Linguistic Perspective on Causality in Discourse*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, UNISA, Pretoria.

Prince, E.F. 1988. Discourse analysis: a part of the study of linguistic competence. In: Newmeyer, F. (ed.) 1988: 164-182

Prinsloo, S.M.C. 1982. *Anaforiek in Afrikaans met spesiale verwysing na Substandaard-afrikaans*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, PU for CHE, Potchefstroom.

Prinsloo, S.M.C. 1987. *Die struktuur van die mondelinge vertelling in Afrikaans*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, PU for CHE, Potchefstroom.

Prinsloo, S.M.C. 1993. Die rol van anaforiek in die spontane mondelinge vertelling in Afrikaans. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 11(2): 59-64. May 1993.

Prinsloo, S.M.C. & H. du Plessis 1988. 'n Struktuuranalise van die spontane mondelinge vertelling in Afrikaans aan die hand van 'n voorbeeld. *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe* 28(4): 336-344.

Reddick, R.J. 1986. Textlinguistics, text theory and language users. *Word* 37(1-2): 31-43.

Retief, R. 1979. *Sinstipes en illokusionêre krag*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, UNISA, Pretoria.

Ryan, R. & S. van Zyl (eds.) 1982. *An Introduction to Contemporary Literary Theory*. Johannesburg: Ad Donker.

Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Scholtz, H. van der M. 1950. *Sistematiese verslag van 'n stilistiese analise. Eugené Marais: Die Towenares*. Amsterdam/Cape Town.

Scholtz, H. van der M. 1951. Stilistiek en literatuurwetenskap. *Standpunte* 21(1).

Scholtz, H. van der M. 1975a. *Herout van die Afrikaanse Poësie en Ander Opstelle*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Scholtz, H. van der M. 1975b. Die literatuurles as taalles. In: Scholtz, H. van der M. 1975a.

Scholtz, J. du P. 1966. Grammatikareël of stylmiddel? In: Van Heerden, E. (ed.) 1966: 118-137.

Sekhukhune, P.D. 1986. Pragmatics of discourse in Northern Sotho: A functional approach. *SA Journal for African Languages* 6(1): 46-50.

Sekhukhune, P.D. 1990. Componential analysis of situational context in Northern Sotho: An introduction to sociolinguistic postulates. *SA Journal for African Languages* 10(1): 29-33.

Senekal, J. (red.) 1986. *Teks, Leser, Konteks* (Gedigte ontleed volgens eietydse metodes.) Johannesburg: Perskor.

Sinclair, A.J.L. (ed.) 1983. *G.S. Nienaber - 'n Huldeblyk*. Bellville: University of the Western Cape Printers.

Sinclair, M. 1992. The effects of context on utterance interpretation: some questions and some answers. In: Botha, R.P. e.a. (eds.) 1992: 61-90.

Sinclair, M. (red.) 1983. *Taalwetenskap en die studie van literatuur. Spil Plus* 8. Stellenbosch: Dept. of general Linguistics, University of Stellenbosch.

Steenberg, A.M.M. 1986. *Die funksie van leksikale herhaling in die kortprosabundel EEN-EN-TWINTIG van J.S. Rabie*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, PU for CHE, Vaal Triangle Campus.

Stubbs, M. 1983. *Discourse Analysis - The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Swanepoel, C.B. 1989. Prolepsis en analepsis: Aspekte van temporele volgorde van die verhaalkuns toegepas op 'n kortverhaal deur E.M. Ramiala. *SA Journal for African languages* 9(2): 79-86.

Theron, H.J. 1992. Die identifikasie van vertellings. *SA Journal for Linguistics,* Supplement 13: 75-90.

Theron, H.J. 1993. *Die ontwikkeling van 'n paradigma vir die skryf van 'n kinderverhaal*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, PU for CHE, Potchefstroom.

Van Coller, H.P. (ed.) 1984. *Woorde as Dade: Taalhandelinge en die Letterkunde*. Pretoria: Butterworth.

Van der Merwe, G.S. 1993. Gambiete. In: Carstens, W.A.M. & E.H. Hubbard (eds.) 1993: 91-106.

Van der Riet, L.M. 1984. *Reëls vir gesprekstrategië in Afrikaans*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, UOFS.

Van Dijk, T.A. (ed.) 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Vol. I: Disciplines of Discourse*. London: Academic Press.

Van Heerden, C. 1965. *Inleiding tot die semantiek*. Johannesburg: Willem Gouws (Pty.) Ltd.

Van Heerden, E. (ed.) 1966. *Smal Swaard en Blink*. Pretoria: Academica.

Van Jaarsveld, G.J. (ed.) 1982. *Wat sê jy? - Studies oor taalhandelinge in Afrikaans*. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill.

Van Jaarsveld, G.J. (ed.) 1987. *Wat bedoel jy?* Pretoria: Serva.

Van Niekerk, A. 1992. *Die omskrywing en klassifikasie van gespreksmerkers as kontekstuele leidrade in Afrikaanse gesprekke*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, UOFS, Bloemfontein.

Van Niekerk, A. 1993. Praat jy soos jy skryf of skryf jy soos jy praat: Die kontak tussen spreker en hoorder. *Dolos* 16(2): 12-21.

Van Rensburg, F.I.J. 1967. Taalkundige raakpunte van die literatuurstudie. *Taalfasette* 3: 34-52.

Van Rensburg, F.I.J. 1992. Stilistiek op taalkundige grondslag. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 504-506.

Van Rensburg, M.C.J. 1976. Wie sê wat? - Die bestudering van voornaamwoordvorming. In: De Klerk, W.J. & F.A. Ponelis (eds.) 1976: 131-140.

Van Rensburg, M.C.J. 1982. Inleiding: Met wat? In: Van Jaarsveld, G.J. (ed.) 1982: xvii-xxxii.

Venter, J.A. 1976. Die vervangende voornaamwoorde *dit* en *hy*: grammatikale getal in die smeltkroes. *Taalfasette* 20(3): 16-24.

Viljoen, H. 1986. 'Die klou dui al die dier aan': oor semiotiek en literatuur. In: Senekal, J. (ed.) 1986: 81-98.

Visser, S.F. & A.J. Weideman 1986. A measure of texture: Cohesion in English radio drama dialogue and actual conversation. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 4(2): 87-105.

Von Gruenewaldt, J.T. 1992. The relevance of linguistic theories in the analysis of literary texts. In: Botha, R.P. e.a. (eds.) 1992: 39-57.

Von Staden, P.M.S. e.a. (eds.) 1993. *Linguistica. Festschrift E.B. van Wyk*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Webb, V.N. (ed.) 1983. *Taalseminaar 1983: Die Funksionalisme*. Study Group for Linguistics: University of Pretoria.

Weideman, A.J. 1984. General and typical concepts of textual continuity. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 2(1): 69-84.

Wessels, E.M. 1993a. Lexical cohesion in student academic writing. In: Carstens, W.A.M. & E.H. Hubbard (eds.) 1993: 75-90.

Wessels, E.M. 1993b. *Bonding and Related Measures of Coherence in Student Academic Writing*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, UNISA, Pretoria.

Wilkes, A. 1983. T. van Dijk se Teksgrammatika. In: Webb, V.N. (ed.) 1983: 67-86.

Wybenga, D.M. 1983. *Grammatiese tydsvergestalting in Afrikaans - 'n linguistiese ondersoek aan die hand van enkele Afrikaanse kortverhale*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, PU for CHE, Potchefstroom.

Wybenga, D.M. 1987. Samehang en die hoorder. *SA Journal for Linguistics* 5(2): 164-174.

Wybenga, D.M. 1988. *Diskoersanalise en Stilistiek: 'n Inleiding*. Pretoria: Serva.

Wybenga, D.M. 1992. Narratiewe weergawes/modules. In: Cloete, T.T. (ed.) 1992: 504-506.

Wybenga, D.M. 1993. Gewete en waargenome wêreld: 'n tekstuele perspektief op Afrikaanse tydsuitdrukking. In: Carstens, W.A.M. & E.H. Hubbard (eds.) 1993: 15-30.

Wybenga, D.M. (red.) 1989. *Taalkompas: Elke student se gids*. Pretoria: Serva.

Yang, A.W. 1989. Cohesive chains and writing quality. *Word* 40(1-2): 235-254.

.....

diskoer1.doc
05/08/1994